REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for considering the pending application. The Final Office Action dated July 7, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-16 are currently pending. No amendments have been made and no new matter has been added. For the purposes of the Office Action mailed July 7, 2010, claims 8-13 have been withdrawn. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0106003 to Chen et al. ("Chen"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To render a claimed invention obvious, the prior art must teach or suggest each and every element in the claim. In making an obviousness determination, the Examiner must consider the size of the prior art genus, bearing in mind that size alone cannot support an obviousness rejection. Importantly, the fact that a claimed species or subgenus is encompassed by a prior art genus is not sufficient by itself to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *See M.P.E.P. 2144.08(II).*

For the purposes of the July 7, 2010, Office Action, the Examiner selected a species of Formula (I) in which R1-R4 are hydrogen. The Office Action admits that Chen does not identify the selected species, i.e. an OLED with a compound of Formula (I) in which R1-R4 are hydrogen. *See Office Action at p. 4.* The Office Action, however, erroneously concludes that this compound would have been obvious in view of Chen because the compound is "within the teachings of Chen et al." *Id.* Disclosing a broad genus, without more, is insufficient to render a claimed species obvious. Chen discloses a genus by a generic formula that includes hundreds if not thousands of different species. There is no direction or motivation given in Chen to select the selected species under current examination. To the contrary, it appears that Chen even

teaches away from the selected species as it explicitly differentiates between what Chen refers to a binaphthalene and a binaphthalene derivative, and explicitly states that the disclosure is directed to a binaphthalene derivative of the generic formula. Chen also discloses a series of preferred embodiments none of which correspond to the structure selected for the purposes of the July 7, 2010, Office Action. Accordingly, without more, it is improper, as even stated in M.P.E.P. 2144.08, to conclude that the selected species in claims 1-3, 5-7, 14, and 15 is obvious in view of Chen alone. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action further rejects claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Japanese Application Publication No. JP 11-302639 A to Sato et al. ("Sato"). The Office Action also rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Japanese Application Publication No. JP 2002-324676 to Suzurisato et al. ("Suzurisato"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 3-4 ultimately depend on claim 1 and claim 16 ultimately depends on claim 14. As discussed above, Chen alone is insufficient to render at least claims 1 and 14 obvious. Neither Sato nor Suzurisato provide the sufficient teachings to cure the deficiencies of Chen. Accordingly, even in view of the combined teachings of Chen and Sato or Suzurisato, the selected species of claims 1 and 14 is still patentable. Consequently, claims 3-4 and 16 are also patentable over the above combined teachings presented in the Office Action. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

The application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: October 5, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: **/Renzo N. Rocchegiani/**

Renzo N. Rocchegiani
Registration No.: 54,824
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant